1997

One Theory, Two Draperies, Three Provinces And A Multitude Of Fabrics: The New Drapery Of French Flanders, Hainaut And The Tournaisis, C.1500-C.1800

Robert S. DuPlessis
Swarthmore College, rduples1@swarthmore.edu

4

ONE THEORY, TWO DRAPERIES, THREE PROVINCES, AND A MULTITUDE OF FABRICS: THE NEW DRAPERY OF FRENCH FLANDERS, HAINAUT, AND THE TOURNAISIS, *c.*1500–*c.*1800

ROBERT S. DUPLESSIS

By the end of the Middle Ages, woollen cloth production had long been established in Francophone or Walloon Flanders. Lille and Douai, the two largest cities, were textile centres, but so were many smaller towns and villages, particularly along the Lys river: as elsewhere in the Low Countries and England, rural cloth-making seems to have been nearly as old as urban. A wide variety of fabrics was woven, ranging from heavy traditional drapery to lighter goods, notably says, known in the area since at least the twelfth century. The taste for innovation that, as Professor Van der Wee has demonstrated, was a hallmark of the Low Countries' textile industry, was also in evidence. Woollens producers accepted new techniques, employed local as well as imported wools, and developed or adopted new types of fabrics in response to competition and changing consumer preferences.

Different locations in French Flanders had prospered at different times—the twelfth and thirteenth centuries proving on the whole more favourable to cities, the fourteenth and early fifteenth to village producers. But by about 1450 rural and urban centres alike were in the grip of a severe depression, though the onset of hard times and the degree of distress varied according to many factors, including competition, the types of cloth produced, and the effects of war. Unbeknownst to contemporaries, however, the downturn was destined soon to be reversed, for seeds of new growth were germinating, notably in the lighter woollens trades, heralding a new phase in the drapery industry.[1]

Much less is known about the cloth trades of Hainaut and the Tournaisis. It is clear, however, that textiles were less important to the

medieval economy of these predominantly agrarian provinces than to that of their neighbour to the west. Still, in their heyday in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Valenciennes and Tournai had been leading drapery producers, exporting goods across western Europe from the Baltic to the Mediterranean. According to Maurice Arnould, at least three rural areas and nineteen of the twenty-two *bonnes villes* of Hainaut still participated in some form of drapery production in the later Middle Ages, although by the end of the fifteenth century the woollens industry was in as parlous a state in Hainaut and the Tournaisis as in French Flanders. By about 1500, only 2,000–3,000 pieces of cloth were being made each year in Tournai, compared with 8,000 annually when the industry had been at its height in the thirteenth century. Yet in these regions, too, a switch to lighter fabrics held promise of renewed prosperity.[2]

In this essay I shall trace the changing fortunes of the new draperies that resuscitated and extended the woollen textile industries of French Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis between the end of the fifteenth and the later eighteenth centuries—from, that is, the revival that began in about 1500 to the eve of factory industrialization. The early modern history of the new draperies in these regions falls into two broad yet distinct secular periods divided by a harsh crisis (or, in some places, crises). The first period (the subject of Part I), which lasted from 1500–20 to about 1620, saw the flowering and definitive decline of one type of new drapery as well as the rapid rise of says and other kinds of very light woollens and mixed fabrics directed largely to foreign markets. In this long sixteenth century, both urban and rural crafts underwent expansion; similarly, the seventeenth-century crisis or crises struck hard at countryside as well as at city.

During the second period (Part II), extending from the mid- or later seventeenth century to the late 1780s, the production of light woollens for export became concentrated in northern French Flanders. Output progressed smartly in several large villages and their surroundings, whereas Lille, although remaining an important centre, lost ground both absolutely and relatively. Some areas in the Spanish (after 1713 Austrian) part of Hainaut and the Tournaisis saw the continuation or even rebirth of new drapery, though now mainly for local and regional consumers. At the same time, both they and other districts whose once-flourishing woollens crafts sank into insignificance turned to linen manufactures—an industry that even made inroads into the new drapery heartland of northern French Flanders. In Part III, I consider

my findings in relation to hypotheses about proto-industrialization and suggest how the patterns of development revealed in these areas support and extend revisionary accounts.

Before embarking upon our study, it may be helpful to specify both the regions and the types of textiles under consideration. By French Flanders, I am referring to that largely French-speaking area detached from the County of Flanders between 1305 and 1369 to be administered directly by the French crown, which upon its return to Burgundian rule remained a separate political entity known formally as the Estates of Lille, Douai, and Orchies and commonly as 'la Flandre wallonne'. The region, conquered by France in 1667–8, forms the central quarter or so of the present-day Département du Nord. The County of Hainaut was divided between France and the Spanish Netherlands by the Peace of the Pyrénées (1659); I shall discuss both portions, which retained many, if often antagonistic, economic ties. Tournai and the Tournaisis, the city and its small hinterland, lay between French Flanders and Hainaut. Originally a French possession (and from 1513 to 1518 briefly under English control), it was incorporated into the Habsburg dominions in 1521, reconquered by France in 1667–8, then ceded to the now Austrian Netherlands by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713).

Defining the term 'new draperies' is a difficult if not impossible task. Included under that rubric is a bewildering variety of fabrics characterized by confusing similarities and differences in nomenclature and technique, the whole further complicated by translation and change over time. In Professor Coleman's account, the products of the *old drapery* are defined as pure woollens woven from carded, short-staple wool, while *new drapery* comprises a more amorphous category of 'technical mixtures', including pure worsteds of combed long-staple wool, half-worsteds, and fabrics combining wool and other raw materials such as linen, goat and camel hair, silk, and cotton. All new draperies represented innovative combinations of traditional methods, or even involved technological retrogression, but all were—and were recognized by contemporaries to be—new products.[3]

Scholars of Low Countries textiles often distinguish three kinds of drapery, based not on length of staple nor on whether the wool was carded or combed—not, in other words, on the distinction between woollens and worsteds—but on the quality of wool employed and the number and complexity of the manufacturing processes. According to Professor Van der Wee, traditional or *old drapery* consisted of high-quality, expensive cloth woven largely from the best English wool,

whereas *new drapery* producers used cheaper wool (commonly from Spain), and simplified processes, thereby turning out fabrics that resembled old drapery but sold for a good deal less. Finally, *light drapery* was made of unoiled, lower-quality wool, typically of local origin or from nearby areas of the continent, often mixed with other fibres. Shearing was usually eliminated and other processes further simplified, yielding cloth of inferior quality but even lower prices. The cloth was fulled and calendered, albeit briefly, so light drapery was not entirely unlike either the old or the new.[4] Thus Van der Wee considers Hondschoote serges part of the 'spectacular' development of light drapery, while to Coleman Hondschoote says were 'one of the many varieties of new draperies'.[5]

In this essay, I cast my net widely, discussing both new and light drapery in the Low Countries sense. I do not distinguish between wool staples and include fabrics like *molleton* (molton) that employed carded wool.[6] What emerges is a picture of repeated locational change and product imitation and innovation, processes that both represented the continuation of long-established patterns and constituted new departures.

I

Thanks to expanding demand, numerous drapery centres in French Flanders prospered once again starting in the later fifteenth century. To be sure, not all prior-existing manufactures revived. In Bousbecque, for example, a village on the Lys between Comines and Halluin that had been a substantial new drapery producer from at least the fourteenth century, only two looms were reported in regular operation in 1505 and 1544, turning out 90–100 cloths a year, and by 1549 no textile making at all was reported.[7] But as Table 9 reveals, something of a new drapery renaissance transpired in a number of cities, towns, and villages during the opening decades of the sixteenth century.

In Lille, output began to increase no later than 1530, with rapid expansion ensuing after 1540. Thanks largely to the adoption of several new types (most notably *flourettes* and *estamettes*), more than 10,000 cloths were sealed in 1550, and that level was maintained for more than two decades.[8] Douai's new drapery likewise revived. Fragmentary records indicate that several thousand pieces were sealed there each year in the 1540s (an unknown proportion of them woven outside the

TABLE 9. *New drapery in French Flanders during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*

Locality	1505		1549		1593		1611	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
Lille				8,488	119	1,137	42	*c.*1,000[a]
Halluin	5–6	60	20[b]	1,000[c]				
Comines	28–30[d]		30	6–800[e]				
Tourcoing		1,950[f]			6			
Armentières	60–80	2,500	6–700	25,000	399[g]	16,192	359	—[h]
Haubourdin				1,459	87		150	*c.*1,000[i]
Bondues					80	*c.*1,215[j]	125	1,872[k]
Houplines					42		70	1–2,000[l]

(A) = number of looms.
(B) = annual output.

[a] Lille was purportedly capable of turning out 4,000 pieces per year; in addition, another 128 looms in the suburbs could produce 7,500 pieces.

[b] 1544.

[c] This figure comes from De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 295 n. 4. According to ADN, B3763, 2,000 *demi-draps* were made annually.

[d] 15–16 operated daily.

[e] 200 sealed draps, 400–600 unsealed *petits draps*.

[f] 'L'on peut faire [this number] chacun an'.

[g] Another 11 looms were found in the parish of Armentières on lands exempt from aldermanic jurisdiction.

[h] Armentières was said to be capable of turning out 22,600 *estamettes*, *draps*, and *bacques* each year.

[i] Haubourdin's potential annual production was estimated at 10,000 *draps* and *estamettes*.

[j] Calculated from the eight-year total (1 May 1593–30 April 1601) of 9,727.5 pieces.

[k] Bondues's possible yearly output was calculated at 6,000 *estamettes*.

[l] Houplines' potential annual output was estimated at 6,900 *estamettes* and *draps*.

Sources: ADN, B3762 (1505), B3763 (1549, save Lille and Halluin); AM Lille, Reg. 16,283, 16,327, 16,348 (Lille output, 1549, 1593, 1611); De Sagher (1951–66), i. 435–49, 466, 643–6 (looms and output in Armentières in 1593, looms in Bondues in 1593), ii. 319–22, 325, 617, 619 (Haubourdin looms in 1593 and output in 1549 and 1593, Houplines looms in 1593 and output in 1611), iii. 421, 604 (looms in Tourcoing in 1593, looms in 1593 and output in 1611 in Bondues); De Sagher (1937), 479 (Lille looms, 1593); AM Lille, Affaires génèrales, Carton 1220, d. 10 (1611 loom totals and estimated possible production as in notes a, f, h, i, k, and l).

city), while 159 new drapers registered in that decade, 141 in the years 1540–3 alone.[9] Equally dramatic was the rebirth of Halluin's industry, which from near-extinction around 1500 had by 1549 regained the level of 1,000 cloths per year found during its prime in 1450–75.[10] At Armentières, output and the number of looms grew tenfold between 1505 and 1549.

This striking expansion was not destined to last for long. At Lille, decline set in after 1575, gaining speed from the mid-1580s. By 1593 average output (about 1,000 cloths a year) was back to the level of the early part of the century. At Douai, downturn arrived a few years earlier, but

it followed much the same path. The group of masters, numbering some seventy-one in 1555, had shrunk to thirty-four in the early seventeenth century. Of these, four had charge of the guild, eight wove regularly, four others turned out a piece every three or four weeks, a widow and a draper's son had just taken up the craft, and the remaining sixteen had abandoned the trade. In 1593 the city's production was too minor to justify inclusion in the new drapery survey. It was suggested at the time that artisans be brought from Lille and Armentières to teach skills Douaisiens had forgotten and that sloppy enforcement of regulations be tightened; in addition, the weaving of additional types of inexpensive fabrics was authorized. But nothing seems to have availed: by 1611 the city's textile makers were said to be in 'extreme need and poverty'.[11]

When queried in that year about the way to restore the drapery of the southern Netherlands, both Lille and Douai strongly urged that imports of foreign—notably English—cloth be entirely cut off.[12] The suggestion pointed to a significant problem. The exodus of artisans from the Low Countries before and especially during the Dutch Revolt and ensuing repression had stimulated production abroad that not only ate into the critical Baltic and Mediterranean markets but also began to undersell Low Countries' cloth at home.[13] In places like Halluin and Comines, which sustained both massive damage during military operations and emigration, the drapery industries had virtually disappeared.[14] But the effects of the Revolt were not the only factors at work. To judge by the nearly simultaneous decline of kerseys in England,[15] new drapery was also feeling competition from the cheaper light draperies, whose fortunes we shall chart below.

Still, as the right-hand columns of Table 9 show, the outlook for new drapery was not entirely bleak in late sixteenth-century French Flanders. In Armentières, which in 1572 had reported just 300 looms currently in even partial operation, more peaceful conditions and concentration on *estamettes* and other newer fabrics brought an upturn. Some 400 looms were counted in 1593, though output remained well below the mid-century peak.[16] Haubourdin's new drapery, reborn around 1530, found that repeated imitation of Armentières as well as of Lille bore fruit. In 1593, the village tallied 87 looms, which gave work to some 2,300 people throughout the environs; by 1611 the number of looms had nearly doubled. The new drapery of Bondues, unknown before the 1593 survey, flourished between that date and 1611, and sustained annual production of about 2,000 cloths from 1605–6 until 1621–2. Strong growth likewise occurred in Houplines, where in 1590

recently arrived new drapery weavers received statutes decreed by the Privy Council in Brussels, which disregarded objections from Lille, Armentières, and several other nearby centres.[17] Tourcoing, which all but abandoned new drapery weaving, nevertheless benefited from the revival, for while there were only six *drap* and *estamette* looms in the village in 1593, 121 people were reported making *estamette* warps for sale in Armentières, Haubourdin, Bondues, and additional nearby towns and villages.[18]

This mini-boom at the beginning of the seventeenth century proved the last hurrah of French Flanders' new drapery. Although 359 looms were counted in Armentières in 1611, the industry took a sharp turn for the worse shortly thereafter. In 1618, despairing of the possibilities of new drapery, the magistrates provided subventions so that drapers could buy wool and thread to weave says, though in the event a couple of hundred pieces of new drapery continued to be made each year in Armentières until the 1730s.[19] In Bondues and Houplines, too, decline set in from the early 1620s. From the 1640s through the mid-1660s, when the records end, Bondues's weavers could count themselves fortunate to turn out 600 cloths a year. Aside from a sharp but short-lived upturn at the end of the 1630s, Houplines normally made just 200–300 pieces annually across the same period.[20] Only Haubourdin retained any importance—as late as the 1680s output averaged 1,000 pieces a year—but its survival could hardly compensate for the collapse of the craft everywhere else in the province.[21]

From all indications—which are very scanty—new drapery played a minor role in Tournai and Hainaut's early modern economy. Admittedly, the craft was practised in at least a few places. In 1518 Ath's new drapery won authorization to weave doublures, and seven years later a new fulling mill was built. Yet regulations were also enacted in 1518 to force weavers to work steadily, to compel drapers to supply weavers with sufficient good-quality thread, and to prohibit the employment of weavers and fullers outside Ath when townspeople were available. Hence sanctioning doublures and constructing a mill seem not so much signs of prosperity as attempts to revive an industry in difficulty. In any event, new drapery was definitely in a bad way in 1550, when the fulling mill had shut down for lack of work. By 1600, the historian of Ath's drapery tells us, the industry had 'virtually disappeared'.[22]

If inclusion in the 1611 survey soliciting advice as to how to restore the industry is any guide, new drapery also survived—or had until recently—in and around Tournai, Mons, and Valenciennes. Like several

other towns, Mons blamed the recent 'guerres intestines' for provoking emigration of artisans and merchants to 'more peaceful' lands. But it pointed as well to competition from Thuin and other producers in the nearby Bishopric of Liège. Because of lower taxes and cheaper food, they turned out *petits draps* for the 'common people' more cheaply than Mons could, though some unnamed villages in Hainaut reputedly managed to make similar low-cost cloth. Valenciennes and Tournai agreed that the departure of many skilled artisans had been a grievous blow and called for measures to discourage thread exports, anticipating that such a measure would stimulate weaving and lure back *émigrés* in search of jobs. Both cities also urged that quality be improved, Valenciennes claiming that much of the decline of drapery had resulted from weavers' ability to ignore existing ordinances and regulations with impunity.[23] Little was done, however, and the trade continued to regress. A document from autumn 1651 found just twenty-five *drap* looms in the homes of fourteen master weavers of Mons; another document from the same year claimed that all but two masters worked 'bien rarement', due as before to competition from Thuin and village producers in Hainaut.[24]

Table 9 shows that at least in French Flanders new drapery output was far from negligible in the sixteenth century. But the most renowned woollens produced in that area, as well as in Hainaut and the Tournaisis, were light draperies, often referred to generically as *sayetterie*. Although large quantities of says had been exported from these regions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, John Munro has shown that the light cloth crafts all but vanished between the early fourteenth and later fifteenth centuries.[25] Around 1500, however, freshly granted corporate charters and newly imposed taxes attest that light drapery was revitalized or even reborn in the larger towns. Thanks to conflicts between rural and urban producers and privileges, their presence can also be discerned in villages before mid-century.

Let us look first at French Flanders. *Sayetterie*-making had had a chequered career in medieval Douai,[26] but it only becomes possible to discern the quantitative dimensions of the industry from the early sixteenth century. Chartered (or rechartered) in 1499, the *sayetterie* corporation included 400–500 looms by 1527. Average yearly output was 10,000–20,000 pieces of say and satin in the late 1530s, 7,000–14,000 in the 1540s (the only years for which tax records exist). In a deposition from 1564, the deans of the guild claimed that the members of the craft

made 8,000–10,000 cloths annually, while six years later there were said to be 500 masters and an unspecified number of workers. Velveteen-makers (also referred to as *bourgetteurs* and *hautelisseurs*), who formed a much smaller group of weavers—twenty to thirty in 1570, twenty to twenty-four in 1578—turned out between 500 and 1,500 light woollens per year in the 1537–47 period.

Corporate leaders confidently asserted in 1564 that its fine colours made Douai's light drapery so sought after that double or triple the current output would easily find buyers. Yet from the very next year there is evidence of repeated problems with thread, including fraudulent mixing of different types and illegal export of the better-quality skeins. Whether or not raw material troubles damaged the city's *sayetterie*, it seems to have suffered rapid and profound decline. Less than 100 pieces of say were inspected and sealed in 1586, and the municipal treasurer wrote of 'temps calamiteux et cessation du mestier de saicterie'. The following year, no one bid for the farm of the seal, which in any event had not been paid for the previous half-decade. By 1603 the city government was pleading for access to Lille's light cloth finishing facilities on the grounds that Douai could not support any of her own, and two years later weavers were said to be begging in order to survive. Just fifty-four masters and one mistress were listed as weaving says in 1615; during the past year, they had taken on only two apprentices, received one new master into their ranks, and seen not even one worker immigrate.[27]

Lille's light drapery reappeared virtually simultaneously with Douai's—initial *bourgetterie* statutes were promulgated in 1496, *sayetterie* four years later—but it enjoyed much greater and more durable success in markets in France, central Europe, Italy (whence some was re-exported to the Levant), Iberia, and Spain's empire in the New World.[28] Says were the first light woollens to experience pronounced growth, joined in the 1520s by woollen satins and in the following decade by *changéants*, a kind of cheap camlet that soon became the mainstay of Lille's light drapery. As early as 1553, Lille's municipal government testified that the city was home to more than 2,000 *sayetterie* masters and in excess of 300 *bourgetterie* masters.[29] By the early 1580s, when it stabilized, output of says, satins, and *changéants* by *sayetteurs* had reached a level about five times above that of the years before 1520. Production by *bourgetteurs*, who also wove *changéants* as well as velveteens and several minor fabrics, similarly began to swell in the first half of the sixteenth century, continuing until about 1620. At that point, velveteen output stood five and a half times above its level in

1540 (the first year for which we have records), while *changéants* woven by *bourgetteurs* had multiplied an astounding eighty-four times.[30]

Lille's light drapery was at its zenith in the early seventeenth century. *Sayetteurs*' output—doubtless buoyed principally by *changéants*—maintained the high levels reached around 1580 up until 1608–9. *Bourgetteurs*' fabrics attained their apex ten years later. But as Table 10 makes clear, the European-wide textile crisis that began in about 1620 struck hard at both crafts,[31] and despite temporary upturns in the 1620s and 1630s, the entire period of the Thirty Years War was difficult for Lille's light woollens industry. The 2,000 or more say looms operating in the later sixteenth century had been reduced to about 1,100 in 1638, date of the first surviving loom census, and their number had fallen to 818 in 1647.[32] As Table 10 shows, in 1641–50 taxes on fabrics woven by *sayetteurs* returned just 42 per cent of their yield during the peak decade 1601–10; levies on *bourgetterie* had dropped by nearly half from their 1611–20 level.

TABLE 10. *Average annual tax income from light drapery in Lille, from 1521–30 to 1641–50 (in livres parisis)*

Decade	*Sayetterie*	*Bourgetterie*
1521–30[a]	1,911.1	—
1531–40[b]	2,947.8	—
1541–50	3,648.1	169.6
1551–60	4,065.4	155.8
1561–70	4,612.8	306.6
1571–80[c]	5,612.9	701.9
1581–90	5,727.6	967.6
1591–1600	5,645.2	1,779.7
1601–10	5,754.7	2,989.4
1611–20	4,240.9	4,061.4
1621–30[d]	4,115.3	3,699.2
1631–40	4,149.1	2,948.2
1641–50	2,425.3	2,201.4

[a] 1529 missing.
[b] 1539 missing.
[c] 1575 missing for *sayetterie* only.
[d] 1625 missing.

Source: Deyon and Lottin (1967), 30–2.

During the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, numerous villages attempted with various degrees of success to start weaving light drapery. Lille, joined by nearby Tournai, bitterly opposed the appearance of light drapery in the countryside, fearing both competition in woven goods and decreased supplies of cheap thread for urban industry.[33] But some villages already possessed drapery-making privileges and, perhaps more important, enjoyed the protection of powerful seigneurs: for example, Philippe de Lannoy, lord of Tourcoing, was *grand maître d'hôtel* for the regent Mary of Hungary. Hence while the towns managed to gain and maintain say and *changéant* monopolies, villages gradually won permission to weave rougher and often mixed fabrics—velveteens, *bourats*, and fustians being the most common.[34]

The rise of rural light drapery in French Flanders across the 'long sixteenth century' is indicated by Table 11, though the magnitude and timing of the expansion is doubtless somewhat distorted. The 1535 and 1548 figures represent the number of looms authorized by central government decrees rather than actual loom counts, and even loom counts themselves do not necessarily correlate with actual production.

Taken together, Tables 10 and 11 show that in northern French Flanders both city and village light drapery prospered for many decades across the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Dutch Revolt

TABLE 11. *Light drapery looms in rural French Flanders, 1535–1608*

Locality	1535	1548	1608[a]
Tourcoing	25	50	48
Roubaix	—	50	166
Leers	—	25	73
Toufflers	—	12	8
Wattrelos	—	—	171
Mouvaux	—	—	64

[a] Besides the 530 looms listed below, another 190 were found in 13 additional villages. Significant concentrations were found in Hem (35), Lys (31), Saint-André (27), Wasquehal (26), and Croix (22). Of the 720 total looms, 497 made velveteen, 181 were for *bourat*, and 26 for fustian.

Sources: AM Lille, Aff. gén. C. 1161, d. 4 (1535); Vanhaeck (1910), i. 272–3 (1548); AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1164 (1608).

may have caused some disruption in the countryside—the extant sources simply do not allow us to say—but in sharp contrast to new drapery, any damage suffered by light woollens was not permanent, even though many people from the area emigrated to Leiden and England.[35] Further, fragmentary output statistics from Roubaix—the sole series available for the countryside—indicate that rural light drapery, like Lille's, contracted sharply and for a protracted period starting in the second decade of the seventeenth century. Annual production, commonly several thousand pieces around 1610, dropped to several hundred at most from *c.*1620 to the early 1630s, when the records give out for more than two decades.[36]

In the first period, in sum, the light drapery centred in northern French Flanders formed in effect a single industry with two parts. A larger urban sector primarily produced says and *changéants*, while a rural one, as yet smaller, specialized in mixed cloths, not to mention some of the thread consumed in the city. Both sectors exhibited similar histories of growth and contraction. From this point on, however, their fates began to diverge considerably. As we shall see, Lille outperformed Roubaix across most of the seventeenth century, but in the course of the eighteenth rural producers came to overshadow their urban counterparts both quantitatively and in terms of dynamism.

Destruction of archives makes it difficult to trace the history of light drapery in Hainaut, but scattered information indicates that it appeared as early as in French Flanders and had an analogous production history during the long sixteenth century. In Valenciennes, says had been woven as far back as the twelfth century, and Lodovico Guicciardini cited them as central to the city's economy in the mid-sixteenth century.[37] Yet in 1611 Valenciennes reported that the '1600–1700 masters operating shops and practising the craft of *sayetterie*' at some unspecified date in the past ('cydevant') had dwindled to just 150. This circumstance was attributed in large part (as was the decline of new drapery) to unrestricted thread exports and the non-enforcement of existing quality regulations, a charge that gains some support from contemporary corporation records.[38]

Even less is known about Mons, where *sayetterie* statutes were promulgated in 1494. Light drapery was clearly thriving in the mid-1560s, when the tax on *sayetterie* fabrics was farmed out at a rate that implied output of between 16,000 and 32,000 pieces a year.[39] Say and other light drapery continued to be made in 1651, but a demand made that year to bar immigrants from weaving any cloth containing say thread suggests

a craft on the defensive.[40] We know virtually nothing about light drapery in Hainaut villages before the end of the seventeenth century, apart from the fact that *sayetterie* appeared (or perhaps reappeared) in Maubeuge in the later fifteenth century, supplanting a nearly defunct drapery industry, and received corporate statutes in 1517.[41]

Like most cities examined here, Tournai had exported says in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, only to see the industry collapse thereafter. Re-established about 1400, the craft was endowed with amended statutes in 1484, joining an already existing corporation of *hautelisseurs* or *bourgetteurs* said to have had 500 masters at some point in the fifteenth century and as many as 600 looms around 1520.[42] Beginning in 1522, shortly after the city's incorporation into Charles V's dominions, payments for tax farms on cloth and raw materials make it possible to outline the evolution of the city's light drapery and to a lesser extent that of the countryside. According to these figures, output grew strongly up to the late 1570s. The farm on *bourgettes* increased thirteenfold between 1522–30 and 1571–80, while the tax on *sayette* thread multiplied seven times across the same period. Unfortunately, civil strife, a siege mounted successfully by the Prince of Parma to capture Tournai for Philip II, subsequent repression and emigration, and bad harvests all ravaged the light cloth industry during most of the 1580s. The *bourgette* farm fell to below 30 per cent of its level in the previous decade, that for *sayette* thread to less than half. Little wonder that all remaining *sayetterie*, drapery, and fulling workers were granted mastership in 1582, that in 1585 apprenticeship and masterpiece requirements were waived for immigrants, or that access to corporations was opened up once again three years later. From 1589, however, rapid recovery set in. By the time it reached its peak in 1611–20, the *bourgette* tax yielded 50 per cent more than in the 1570s, while at its apex during the 1630s the *sayette* thread farm was two-thirds higher, very likely driven up and sustained by demand from rural weavers, who bought thread in the city, and probably also from wool-stocking weavers in the city itself. Then, like its counterpart in French Flanders, Tournai's light drapery went into decline, but at a slower rate, for by the mid-seventeenth century the *bourgette* farm was down just a third from its high point, say thread less than an eighth.[43]

The long sixteenth century formed an extended period of substantial woollen textile advance across much of French Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis, striking evidence of the acceptance that cheap southern

Netherlands cloth won in many markets. Demand was sufficiently vigorous, in fact, that some long-established new drapery crafts, as well as a handful of recent imitators, enjoyed a remarkable burst of prosperity. Even in 1611 at least 862 new drapery looms were to be found in the villages of the castelry of Lille, outnumbering the 720 light drapery looms counted just three years before.[44] When urban production is taken into account, however, it becomes clear that light drapery was already far more important. And indeed the future belonged to light woollens—though not, as the example of Douai had already demonstrated, to all the centres that had emerged over the past century. Beginning around 1620, an increasingly deep crisis greatly diminished the woollens industry in many places, promoted concentration of weaving into a small number of centres, and issued in new intra- and inter-regional specializations and divisions of labour.

II

French Flanders' urban light drapery managed to survive the seventeenth-century depressions, which in some places persisted into the eighteenth, and even to prosper on occasion. That production of *sayetterie*-type fabrics continued in Douai—at what level, we cannot say—is indicated by repeated (and uniformly rebuffed) attempts to gain permission to use Lille's finishing facilities.[45] At some point in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, a sizeable camlet manufacture was set up in Douai, which at one time purportedly employed 217 looms and provided work to some 500 townspeople. It seems, however, to have failed by 1762, when masters of Lille's *sayetterie* corporation, using money provided by the municipal government, began to buy 173 looms for camlets, *baracans*, and similar cloth from Douai to keep them out of the hands of rural producers.[46] Apparently, this sale ended any substantial woollens production in Douai. In 1782 the municipal Bureau de Charité did seek to establish manufactures of camlets and like fabrics to give work to the town poor, but little result can be seen. Prefect Dieudonné, reporting on conditions in 1789, mentioned only 'several looms' operating in one quarter of Douai without giving any other details, and indeed precious little textile work of any sort was to be found in the city.[47]

For Lille's light drapery, as Table 12 shows, the second half of the seventeenth century was a period of stagnation or slight recovery.

TABLE 12. *Average annual light drapery output in Lille from 1641–50 to 1691–1700 (in livres parisis)*

Decade	*Sayetterie*	*Bourgetterie*	*Grands changéants*[a]
1641–50	2,425.3	2,201.4	18,560
1651–60	2,539.4	2,316.5	18,000
1661–70	2,724.0	2,218.4	19,600
1671–80[c]	2,754.0	2,397.1	—
1681–90	—	2,838.9	—
1691–1700	—	2,474.7	18,272

[a] Levy on all textile products exported by merchants. This information was not recorded before 1634.

[c] 1678 is missing.

Source: Deyon and Lottin (1967), 32–3.

Although output never approached levels attained earlier in the century, copying Valenciennes-style *baracans* and immigration from Hondschoote helped to offset the loss of some traditional customers after the French conquest in 1667.[48] Yearly figures, as well as scattered loom censuses, disclose that output fluctuated considerably over the short run. Taxes on says, for example, rose from 2,114 livres parisis in 1659 to 2,946 the following year, but were back down to 2,638 by 1662; those on *bourgetterie* went from 1,876 livres parisis in 1680 to 3,119 (1681) to 2,503 (1684). Similarly, 1,102 *sayetterie* looms were found in 1638, 937 in 1650, 1,192 in 1681. In 1638, 357 master *sayetteurs* operated shops, as against 336 in 1650, 393 in 1661, and 387 in 1675.[49]

As the end of the century approached, however, the situation soured once more. The number of *sayetterie* looms in operation, declining slowly between 1681 (1,192) and 1687 (1,019), suddenly fell precipitously: to 904 in 1688, 812 in 1691, 785 the next year, 717 in 1693, just 562 in 1694.[50] Output dropped equally quickly and steeply. According to figures provided by municipal officials, 60,000–65,000 fabrics were made each year between 1685/6 and 1687/8, but just 36,445 in 1689/90, and output was running at an abysmal annual rate of about 31,000 to 32,000 pieces in the first nine months of 1693–4.[51]

Nor, despite a brief rally that put eighty more *sayetterie* guild looms back to work by 1696, were the woes besetting Lille's light drapery at an end. A revival that began with the new century, bringing the *sayetterie*

loom total back up to 692 in 1706, was in turn aborted by the Dutch invasion and occupation (1708–13), prolonged by the existence of large stocks of cheap English and Dutch cloth remaining in Lille even after the foreign troops had left. In 1716 just 371 *sayetterie* looms were in operation while another 800 gathered dust; 600 masters were unemployed or found what work they could in the employ of their more fortunate fellows. Others had emigrated.[52] Admittedly, the fortunes of the light cloth weaving industry did improve for a few years thereafter. The number of *sayetterie* seals, which had sunk as low as 29,000 in 1714, rose as high as 61,000 in 1722. Once again, however—though at an undeterminable date—decline set in: in 1735, according to corporate records, only 35,000 *sayetterie* pieces were sealed. By the 1740s, the total was lower, though the available documents are not of sufficiently high quality to clarify either the severity or the precise dating of the deterioration. Perhaps English competition was partly to blame, for the 1730s and 1740s saw high levels of exports from that country, 'largely due to improved sales of woollen cloth', while 1729–51 has been characterized as 'one of the major periods of growth' for the West Riding textile trades.[53]

At Lille, the decades around mid-century apparently saw some stabilization. Table 13 indicates that output remained about level between *c.*1740 and *c.*1770, while the number of *sayetterie* looms in operation, some 866 in 1764, stood at 846 in 1769. But in the 1770s the trend turned down yet again.[54]

Yet Lille remained a major light cloth centre up to the French Revolution. The last extant *sayetterie* census, which dates from 1782, listed 610 looms. Prefect Dieudonné credited the city with 800 of the province's 830 camlet looms in 1789, producing cloth for export throughout western Europe and the Americas.[55]

The decline of light drapery weaving in Lille harmed the urban combing trade that prepared wool to be spun into *sayette* thread on the small wheel. The rise of rural combing, which accompanied the renewed expansion of village light cloth weaving, also contributed strongly to the decay of the urban craft. It was hurt, too, by mercantilist actions taken simultaneously by the government of the Austrian Netherlands, culminating in a measure of 1756 that quadrupled the export duty on raw wool while eliminating all levies on combed wool. As a result, by 1778 much of the wool woven in French Flanders was being combed in nearby Austrian Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis, often by French workers who commuted across the border from frontier

TABLE 13. *Average annual number of pieces of light drapery sealed in Lille, 1673–1708 to 1771–5*

Period	*Sayetterie* (1)	*Sayetterie* (2)	*Bourgetterie*
1673–1708	47,664	—	116,700
1708–30	—	—	56,151
1708–40	30,000	—	—
1730–55	—	—	24,184
1740–50	23,600	31,200[a]	—
1750–68	22,388	31,420	—
1755–71	—	—	20,816
1768–75	17,860	27,750	—
1771–75	—	—	17,080

[a] 1741–50.

Sources: *Sayetterie* (1) and *bourgetterie* are taken from a document written by the *sayetterie* corporation, 17–29 Nov. 1775, in Vanhaeck, (1910), ii. 355, dec. 165. The grouping into periods is that found in the document; no reasons are given for the divisions. *Sayetterie* (2) is calculated from accounts of scals per year, which according to Vanhaeck give, 'at least approximately, the number of pieces made'; ibid. i. 284, n. 2.

villages. Corporate records, which have survived only for the eighteenth century, indicate that the number of masters and workers combing in Lille dropped by 70 per cent between 1711 and 1761 before staging something of a come-back across the next two decades, perhaps the result of increasing consumption by hosiers or rural weavers. Even so, the trade contracted again in the 1780s. The 140 or so combers in Lille in 1789 cut a poor figure compared with the 1,600 in and around Tourcoing, the leading rural centre in French Flanders, not to mention the unknown numbers across the border.[56]

In contrast to the long, though by no means unbroken, decay of Lille's light drapery across the eighteenth century, cheap carded woollens staged something of a come-back in the city, led by recent creations such as *pinchinats* (a rough *drap*), *ras*, and *couvertures*, as well as *molletons*, woven from a woof of waste wool and a linen warp. The revival dated at least to 1686, when a prominent merchant and alderman, with the aid of municipal subventions, started up an enterprise to make Dutch and English-style drapery. The initiative quickly prospered: the 24 looms counted in 1688 had become more than 200 by 1701, helped in large part by heavy tariffs on cloth from England and the Netherlands.

Like light drapery, these woollen trades were badly damaged by the Dutch occupation, but renewed protection brought the number of looms back to 48 in 1733. In 1789, 24 manufacturers owned 120 looms with an annual output of 5,300 pieces of *drap* and *pinchinat* for sale to the peasantry, working class, and religious houses of French Flanders and nearby provinces of France and the Austrian Netherlands. At that point, Lille also had 150 of the 622 *molleton* looms found in northern French Flanders and eleven *couverture* looms; these cloths too were sold primarily in France and the Low Countries.[57] Neither in quantity nor in market orientation, however, did these crafts compensate for the waning of the city's light drapery.

Much of the seventeenth century was no kinder to village than to city light drapery. If anything, in fact, Lille's trades fared better during this time than Roubaix's. For while an upturn occurred in both centres around mid-century, in Lille it continued through the middle of the 1680s (Table 12), whereas in Roubaix production dropped abruptly once more from *c.*1660 and remained low until *c.*1685. At that point, the conjuncture reversed in each. Lille's light drapery suddenly collapsed, while Roubaix's reached a level of output (in excess of 1,000 pieces a year) not attained since the beginning of the century and then maintained it for a decade. In the mid-1690s, both changed direction once again, as Lille underwent a short-lived revival while Roubaix fell off steeply. For a brief moment at the start of the eighteenth century, light drapery in town and village alike moved upward, and both saw their prosperity sabotaged by the Dutch occupation. But from then on, their paths diverged for good. At Roubaix, recovery came quickly and proved durable. Despite brief cyclical downturns every ten years or so, and a more prolonged but still moderate contraction from *c.*1755 until the early 1760s, its light woollen output consistently expanded across the eighteenth century. In 1701–10, annual output averaged 5,500 pieces; by the 1730s, nearly 20,000 pieces; in the 1780s, more than 41,000 cloths. Lille's long-term trend, as we have seen, was downward.[58]

In the mid-eighteenth century, Roubaix's woollens, perhaps aided by rising wage rates across the Channel, were besting English goods in Spain, the Levant, and the Indies. They were also sold in France, Holland, and the Austrian Netherlands.[59] By 1771, 140 manufacturers (*fabricants*) were said to give work to some 10,000 people in Roubaix and twenty-three surrounding hamlets.[60] Most were engaged in making *calamandes*, a generic name for fabrics (including, according to Dieudonné, *bourats*, *baracans*, serges, damasks, *prunelles*, and many others)

woven of *sayette* thread spun from wool coming from Holland, northern France (French Flanders, Hainaut, the Cambrésis, and Artois), and nearby provinces of the Austrian Netherlands, combined with local flax and imported silk and goat hair.[61] Only the aftermath of the Eden Treaty of 1786, which by lowering tariffs unleashed a flood of English goods into France, ended the secular upsurge that peaked at 52,466 pieces in 1787.[62]

In the sixteenth century, the light drapery of Lille and Roubaix had grown concomitantly, though with urban far overshadowing rural trades, and both had suffered sharp reverses from about 1620. But beginning in the mid-seventeenth century, their histories rarely ran parallel. During the second half of that century, Lille had done relatively better than Roubaix, probably reflecting the advantages of an urban location and trading contacts during the French conquest and the subsequent commercial readjustments that it necessitated. But from *c.*1715 town and village exchanged places for good: Roubaix rather steadily advanced while Lille—though with more pauses—declined. By the second half of the eighteenth century, village produced more light drapery than city.

Table 14, which hints at Roubaix's late seventeenth-century light drapery troubles as well as its outstanding eighteenth-century success,[63] also indicates that adjacent Tourcoing largely abandoned light

TABLE 14. *Light drapery looms in Roubaix and Tourcoing, 1671, 1693, 1789*

Year	Roubaix	Tourcoing
1671	551	—
1693	*c.*500[a]	*c.*500[b]
1789	1,608[c]	142[d]

[a] All *calamandes.*

[b] 380 made *bourats*, the rest made other sorts of *calamandes.*

[c] 1600 made *calamandes*; 8 made camlets.

[d] 120 wove *calamandes*, 22 made camlets.

Sources: For 1671, Rousseau (1969), 77; for 1693, Lottin (1986*a*), 85, Lottin (1968), 54 (same material in tabular form); for 1789, Dieudonné (1804), ii. 436–45. A document from 1780, which counted 1,600 looms in Roubaix (Rousseau (1969: 77)) indicates that Dieudonné's figures were probably correct.

drapery weaving across this period. This latter village did not, however, give up cheap woollens production but switched to *molletons*. Reputedly invented by a local man in the early eighteenth century, these stuffs were used in jackets and linings sold to peasants and the urban *bas peuple* throughout France. Soon after their appearance, Lille's *bourgetteurs* and *sayetteurs* claimed sole right to them by virtue of several seventeenth-century decrees. Yet although between 1732 and 1777 rural *molleton* weaving was outlawed—and the prohibitions enforced by seizure of village *molletons* whenever they appeared in Lille and at least once on the Tourcoing market—Tourcoing's craft survived. In 1748, 2,000 people in the village were said to be employed just in making *molletons*, women and girls spinning the linen warp, men and boys carding and spinning the woollen woof and weaving the cloth.[64] According to later testimony, output reached its apogee during the era of the American Revolution, as colonists spurning English goods provided enough demand to keep 600 looms and 6,000 workers busy.[65] And though the end of the Revolution and later the Eden Treaty provoked a downturn, according to Dieudonné 360 of the region's 622 *molleton* looms were to be found at Tourcoing in 1789.[66]

At the same time, Tourcoing became the leading regional centre for preparing wool. In the 1720s, if not earlier, thread was spun there for use across the border in the Austrian Netherlands as well as locally. A report of 1790 noted that spinning employed 8,000 people (4,500 women, 3,000 children, 500 men) in Tourcoing and nearby villages.[67] Despite the emergence of competing businesses across the frontier, Tourcoing also turned into a major producer of combed wool. Its 1,600 workers comprised four-fifths of the future Département du Nord's total in 1789, supplying weavers and hosiers in the region, in Artois, and as far away as Amiens, Rouen, and Paris.[68]

Both the same ability to adapt to changing conditions and some degree of specialization were likewise to be seen in the smaller *bourgs* and villages of northern French Flanders. Once an old drapery centre, Lannoy had switched to velveteens at some point in the sixteenth century. It continued to make them well into the eighteenth century, when the development of wallpaper all but obliterated the market for this fabric. Thereafter, some weavers switched to making *ras* and *pinchinats*, others made *calamandes*, while the majority took up *molletons* (to the extent of 85 looms in 1789).[69] Wattrelos, the largest of the village light cloth centres in 1608, when it too specialized in velveteens, also subsequently turned to *molletons*: in 1750, 80–100 weavers of the fabric

were said to be located there.[70] And while it is not possible to cite them in detail, a least a dozen other villages and hamlets likewise were engaged in light cloth spinning, combing, and weaving—often, it appears, under the tutelage of increasingly powerful entrepreneurs from Tourcoing and Roubaix.[71]

In some respects, the evolution of the light woollens trades of Hainaut and the Tournaisis during the second early modern period resembled that of French Flanders, though on a smaller scale. While records are few, they indicate a similarly prolonged depression across much of the seventeenth century, followed by an eighteenth-century revival resulting in a tendency to specialization in particular villages and districts. In addition, light draperies all but disappeared from one urban centre, despite a last attempt at survival by the adoption of new types of fabrics. In contrast to Lille, however, at Tournai, Mons, and Valenciennes light drapery output failed to stabilize in the later seventeenth century after an initial retreat earlier in the century. And in contrast to French Flanders as a whole, where camlets and *calamandes* were destined for external even more than internal markets, the cheap woollens woven in eighteenth-century Hainaut and the Tournaisis were directed almost exclusively at local consumers or those in neighbouring provinces, such as Flanders. Combers and spinners too produced mainly for nearby customers, even if at times these lay across the border that from 1667–8 separated areas long united politically and economically.

At Tournai, light drapery output had undergone a gradual decline from the early seventeenth century, but following the French conquest in 1667 the pace accelerated. Here, in contradistinction to Lille, an urban setting proved no boon to light woollens under conditions of war, conquest, and economic reorientation. By 1671–80, *bourgetterie* production and sales of *sayette* thread had been reduced to less than 40 per cent of their peak levels, and by 1717, after the Tournaisis was reintegrated into the Austrian Netherlands, both were virtually extinct.[72] At least one effort was made in 1699 to provide employment for 'a great number of poor townspeople' by opening a new textile manufacture, but it soon came to naught, victim of a siege in 1709 that disrupted deliveries and delayed payment for large amounts of cloth purchased by the army.[73]

In the event, neither the dwindling away of *sayetterie* and *bourgetterie* nor this failed attempt spelled the end of Tournai's woollens industry, though it is unclear how long the trades remained at a very reduced level. By 1751, date of our next information, the city's weavers were

credited with turning out camlets, *calamandes*, *croisées*, serges, and *molletons*, although no quantitative details were provided. It was also noted that while Lille's 'manufactures et fabriques' were prospering, Tournai's had 'degenerated' after being cut off from France. Documents from 1762 and 1764 mention 33 *molleton* masters employing 80 urban workers, along with one substantial camlet enterprise with 30 looms, 62 workers in Tournai, and an annual output of 1,000 pieces of fabric. Also named were two smaller camlet producers each with three or four looms and ten or so workers, two serge weavers, and numerous combers.

Government intervention seems to have played a role in stimulating development, for the large camlet *fabrique* had been established in 1756 with the aid of a concession (*octroi*). The expressed hope was to take advantage of lower wages to undersell Lille, though it was acknowledged that the beginnings of the enterprise had proven difficult due to insufficiently skilled and hard-working weavers, problems with obtaining sufficient wool (Lille merchants tended to secure it first), and the lack of a dye-works in Tournai. Whatever the eventual success of the endeavour—I have seen no subsequent survey—the number of looms making light woollens and mixed stuffs, certainly less than 100 in the mid-1760s, was far below Lille's (more than 800 for *sayetterie* goods alone). And whereas in the previous century Tournai's says and other cloths had been exported to Seville, and thence doubtless to the Americas, by the 1750s if not earlier its woollen goods were being sold exclusively in the Austrian Netherlands and, to a lesser extent, in France. It was linens, which busied more looms than woollens, that formed the basis of Tournai's export trade in the eighteenth century, sending goods to France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, England, and Holland as well as to other parts of the southern Netherlands.[74]

In 1676, Mons's municipal government amalgamated the previously separate say and *drap* corporations and suspended all fees, apprenticeship, and mastership requirements for any master from elsewhere who would come to the city.[75] But the evidently troubled industry survived. Fifteen masters were present at a meeting of the corporation in 1713; in 1738 eleven guild masters employed some 700 workers, all but 100 of whom were probably spinners in the countryside, and in 1749 thirteen *fabricants* controlled a total of 67 looms and one manufacturer of flannels had seven.[76] By 1764, eight entrepreneurs belonged to the drapery guild, practising a craft said to have been established in the city for nearly 150 years. They employed 104 looms to weave local wool into

about 4,700 pieces (some 220,000 ells) of *drap*, serge, *molletons*, *carisées*, *calamandes*, camlets, and other woollens each year for sale around Mons and in neighbouring Flanders. About 1,200 workers were said to be employed in town and country, the great majority of them peasant women spinners. Some manufacturers, it was reported, specialized in only a few varieties of cloth, but others made every kind, 'setting their looms to work sometimes on one type, sometimes on another'. Another sixteen looms, in four *fabriques* run by Frenchmen who had come to Mons eight years earlier, gave work to 100 people making 360 *pannes* or plush (21,360 ells) annually. Combers, carders, and spinners also lived in the city, which housed as well two dye-works and had several fulleries right outside the walls.

The year 1764 seems to have been a high point for members of the drapery corporation, for between 1766 and 1769 the number of their looms operating sank to between 58 and 61. Even in 1776 (time of the next and last survey), an upturn had only brought the number of looms back to 77, producing just 100,000 ells. Plush-making did somewhat better: ten *fabriques* had 50 looms in 1767 and 49 looms two years later. But in 1776 their number had fallen to 30 (plus another five weaving *pannes sur poil* in an establishment begun during the last year) and between them all the looms accounted for only 15,000 ells of *panne*. So while cheap woollens production continued in Mons, it provided only about 250–300 urban jobs even in 1764, while the 5,000 pieces turned out that year were just one third the number woven two centuries before. Like Tournai, Mons did become something of a linen centre, with 120 looms counted in 1764 (date of the only report we have). In contrast to Tournai's, however, the linens of Mons were sold primarily in the city itself and its neighbourhood. Mons also had a cotton industry, though after 1764 this trade seems to have fallen prey to the same kind of downturn as woollens, plummeting from 107 looms in that year to 67 in 1769 and just 33 in 1776.[77] In the eighteenth century, in short, not even the addition of non-woollen textiles enabled Mons to regain her earlier status as a major production centre of textiles for export.

Scattered documents indicate that a woollen industry persisted in Valenciennes, but from all evidence it was waning across the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1671 leaders of the *sayetterie* corporation (whose members now wove little but *baracans* or *bouracans*, a type of rough camlet) noted that their trade, 'which is almost the only one remaining in this city', had little business. Masters found it difficult to survive; workers were emigrating.[78] Only 34 *baracan* masters were

counted in 1699, just 25 to 30 in 1713. They were said to employ few workers and almost no apprentices, so in 1723, with a mere five masters remaining, the craft was opened up to all comers. *Baracan* makers' problems stemmed, the municipal government maintained, in part from the disruptions caused by war, but (in an echo of its predecessors' assertions back in 1611) 'principally' from declining quality due to the non-observance of regulations and the use of inferior wool and dyestuffs. Competition from crafts in Lille and Abbeville also played a role. Weavers complained of difficulties in obtaining thread now that spinners in the area had found that they could earn more preparing flax than wool. Yet the fact that, as weavers themselves admitted, thread was available from the Beaumont, Mons, and Tournai districts in the Austrian Netherlands suggests that problems created by raw material supplies ought not to be exaggerated.

In common with many troubled centres, Valenciennes tried to avert the demise of its woollens industry by innovation. According to a later document, some producers, aided monetarily by the city government, turned to rough serges and *cazées*, used for soldiers' uniforms, and the industry 'was on the point of flourishing' before 1720. Unfortunately, hopes were dashed by competition from rural weavers across the nearby border. They were said to have 'much more aptitude (*facilité*)' than their French counterparts, and therefore could produce goods for less. So by the middle of the century serges and *cazées* were woven by no more than ten masters—only two of whom made significant amounts—and by 1781 the trade consisted of a lone master with four looms. Even more than in Tournai and Mons, it was linens that far and away dominated Valenciennes's textiles in the eighteenth century, though this industry too left the town for the countryside as the century wore on.[79]

Rural Hainaut's cheap drapery resembled its urban counterpart in several key respects during this period. Attempts to adapt to adverse conditions were to be found throughout the province, but many did not prosper for long, particularly in the districts conquered by France in the mid-seventeenth century. Again, the cheap woollens industry that did survive used carded as well as combed wool, making *molletons* as well as serges and *cazées*, thereby confounding distinctions between new and light drapery. Like towns, too, villages in Hainaut came to produce mainly for local markets or those in nearby regions, and preparatory trades became more important than weaving, most likely to an even greater extent than in Mons or Tournai given the predominantly rural location of spinning.

At Maubeuge, serges, *cazées*, and similar light stuffs had replaced says by the early eighteenth century. Despite charging slightly higher prices than rivals in the Netherlands, the industry may have prospered for several decades on the basis of superior quality, for Maubeuge producers claimed to pay close attention to regulations, prohibit the use of mechanical stretchers, and carefully inspect both wool and woven cloth. In the 1730s, Maubeuge had twenty-eight merchant manufacturers of *calamandes*, camlets, *estamines*, *molletons*, serges, *cazées*, and a variety of other fabrics, and they were said to employ in excess of one thousand people in the *bourg* and neighbouring villages (at least seven-eighths of whom must have been spinners). But shortly after, the 5–6 patar per ell price advantage enjoyed by competitors across the border began to tell; perhaps quality mattered less than cost to the peasants and workers who bought the cloth. By mid-century just seven masters remained, operating thirty-four looms and weaving 1,700 pieces of cloth each year, their fellows having switched once again, this time to stocking-making.[80]

The same fate befell Bavay, Avesnes, and half a dozen other villages near the frontier. In 1779, when total recorded output of serges, *cazées*, and *molletons* in French Hainaut amounted to 5,150 pieces consumed mainly by the local peasantry and soldiers, Maubeuge counted just twelve looms making 1,100 pieces, while Avesnes and its region had eight turning out some 400 cloths. Only Solre-le-Château, with fifty looms weaving 3,000 pieces per year, was a centre of significance.[81] Ten years later, an estimated 800 male and female spinners were employed in the district to supply a total of eighty looms. Output may have been as high as 6,000 pieces in 1788, but it was just 2,863 in the following year.[82] A recent calculation for the whole of French Hainaut and the Cambrésis, urban and rural, suggests that *c.*1791 at least 1,500 spinners and 450–500 other workers (weavers, combers, finishers) made a living from light woollens. This is not a trivial number, but it falls far below the more than 50,000–60,000 people employed full time by the linen industry, along with perhaps 40,000–50,000 more who worked intermittently.[83]

As already noted, during the eighteenth century the chief competitors of the new drapery of rural French Hainaut were to be found in villages just a few kilometres away in the Austrian Netherlands. At present, we have no information about their situation before the mid-eighteenth century, but surveys taken at that time are as invaluable for the countryside as for Mons and Tournai. From them we learn that a couple of the larger *bourgs* (they had ranked among Hainaut's *bonnes villes* in the

Middle Ages) had moderate concentrations of looms. Fifteen kilometres east of Tournai in Leuze, for example, which had been a new drapery producer two centuries earlier (though of unknown magnitude), the municipal and provincial administrations made a concerted effort shortly after 1750 to establish a manufactory of *pannes*, *calamandes*, says, serges, and the like. The attempt bore fruit for at least the decade of the 1760s, for which alone we have records. The six looms found in 1762 had increased to fifteen five years later, most producing cloth on the basis of orders from local individuals. Whether or not the result of similar initiatives, in 1764 three manufacturers of say and *carisée* in Binche (on the eastern edge of Hainaut, some 15 km. from Mons) owned ten looms and gave work to fifteen weavers and combers.[84]

Further to the south lay Beaumont, which trumpeted its long traditions and corporate organization. Despite a slowdown in sales that had recently idled 14 looms and led 150 workers to emigrate, in 1764 28 looms making says, *carisées*, and *molletons* gave work to 392 people, at least 225 of whom would have been spinners. Employers in Chimay, in southernmost Hainaut, where the making of *molletons*, camlets, and the like was said to have been established in the mid-seventeenth century, provided work to twenty to twenty-five weavers in the *bourg* and neighbouring villages and hamlets.[85] In addition, several villages and hamlets, each housing a loom or two, were to be found in the neighbourhood of all the *bourgs*, as well as around Mons.[86] All used local raw materials to make very cheap goods for local peasants, workers, and townspeople in their own and nearby provinces of the Austrian Netherlands and, albeit illegally, France, where, as we have seen, these fabrics enjoyed a decided price edge over indigenous cloth.

Though the rural weaving crafts of Austrian Hainaut and the Tournaisis may have constituted formidable competition for the equally small-scale and locally oriented new drapery of French Hainaut, woollen spinning and combing—for French as well as internal markets—were much more considerable activities in the area. Villages throughout the countryside engaged in these activities, but they were especially to be found near the border, perhaps to cut delivery costs and hasten delivery, though just as likely to profit from opportunities for smuggling. All of the one hundred inhabitants of the village of Montignies-sur-Roc, it was claimed in 1763, washed and combed wool, and fifty or more men, women, and children worked at least part time at these tasks in both Sivry and Grandrieu; all were on or very close to the frontier.[87] Already in 1729, Valenciennes's new drapery and stocking weavers

were said to rely on thread from the neighbourhoods of Tournai, Mons, and Beaumont,[88] and thirty-five years later officials from the area of Esplechin (on the border directly east of Lille), where every woman and girl was allegedly employed as a spinner, contended that '[t]he French cannot dispense with our raw materials', including both flax and wool. The 800 spinners who laboured steadily from All Saints' Day to Easter in Rongy, Rumes, Wannehain, and Bourguilles, all settlements (like Esplechin) south and south-east of Tournai, however, purportedly worked only for establishments in that city, and even at Esplechin enough wool remained after French purchases to satisfy internal needs.[89]

So while both rural and urban Hainaut and the Tournaisis maintained some cheap woollens weaving in the eighteenth century, their manufactures were small in the aggregate and had essentially lost the export orientation characteristic of their more substantial sixteenth-century predecessors. Now their woollen textiles were destined predominantly for quite local markets. Linen became the leading textile sector for both domestic and foreign markets. The only drapery work that continued to provide a large amount of employment and (at least in the Austrian Netherlands) significant exports consisted of spinning and combing. So in terms of woollens, Hainaut and the Tournaisis became predominantly processors of raw materials integrated into an inter-regional division of labour centred on French Flanders.[90] Under the sexual division of labour generally obtaining at the time, the labour force became largely female as preparatory processes emerged as the main light drapery activities.

The woollens industry of French Flanders remained much larger but increasingly came to be concentrated in the northern part of the area, notably the triangle between Lille, Roubaix, and Tourcoing, including the villages located therein. Douai's attempts to rejoin the ranks of light drapery producers all miscarried, while the Lys valley *bourgs* and villages followed Hainaut and the Tournaisis into linens after a final flowering of new drapery in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[91] Significantly, Lille itself housed 980 linen looms and 600 flax thread-twisting mills in 1789.[92] Light drapery, which remained primarily oriented towards foreign markets, was found nearly exclusively in Lille and Roubaix. But if the city maintained large-scale production, its *sayetterie* and *bourgetterie* were on the decline, while Roubaix's industry was growing. To some degree, Lille's troubles were the obverse of rural expansion, which overtook Lille's as well as English cloth in traditional

markets. The waning of Lille's light drapery can also be traced to the widespread implementation of mercantilist measures, as can be seen by the fact that its camlets (like Tourcoing's *molletons*) enjoyed a short-lived boost after rebellious American colonists stopped buying English cloth.[93]

Lille's other cloth also depended on exports. According to Dieudonné, only one-thirtieth of the city's *gingas* linen used for shirting and ticking was sold in the Département du Nord and another twelve-thirtieths elsewhere in France. The remainder went to the American colonies of France and Spain. Similarly, one-third of Lille's vast output of cheap lace went to Italy and America, another third was smuggled into England, and the final third was consumed in France. Twisted thread went to Spain, Italy, Switzerland, England, and the Indies as well as lace-making areas of France.[94] *Molletons*, however, whether woven in Lille or in Tourcoing, were sold in the protected domestic market, as were the new draperies that reappeared in Lille. Only under exceptional circumstances such as the American Revolution, it appears, could these fabrics compete successfully in export markets.

Much more than in Hainaut and the Tournaisis, then, a degree of specialization developed among the woollens centres of French Flanders during the eighteenth century, most notably in terms of types of cloth but also with respect to stages in the production process. With its concentration of spinning and combing, Tourcoing and its dependencies had a preponderantly female labour force. Yet the great amount of weaving carried on in this *bourg*, in many nearby villages, and especially in Roubaix and Lille—not to mention Lille's finishing trades—meant that the woollens industry of the area continued to employ a substantial number of adult men.

III

Studies of proto-industrialization typically postulate or assume a distinct and complementary regional division of labour in which cities provided financing, co-ordination, and marketing, while also specializing in commodities and services requiring greater amounts of skill, supervision, and capital. In rural areas, blessed with lower wages, taxes, and cost of living, urban merchants introduced putting-out systems to produce goods that were labour-intensive but demanded less skill.[95]

Evidence from the textile trades of French Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis can be cited in support of many elements of this model.

Relatively low-skill labour-intensive trades like spinning and, increasingly, combing and weaving were carried on in many villages, often with materials put out by urban entrepreneurs. As early as 1612, for example, it was alleged that unnamed merchants of Lille regularly distributed wool to *bourgetterie* makers in Roubaix, Tourcoing, Wattrelos, Armentières, and other village centres. One Lillois was said to control 40–50 looms operated by country folk.[96] Conversely, Mons, Tournai, and Lille all had silkworks, and the latter two cities made carpets and tapestries; Lille, at least, also wove velvet plush, gold and silver cloth, and other expensive goods. In addition, all were home to fullers, dyers, calenders, and other finishers. Lace, a trade in which quick response to shifting fashions was a *sine qua non* for success, throve in eighteenth-century Lille, which in 1789, according to Dieudonné, housed 13,600 of the 14,000 lace-makers of the future Département du Nord.[97]

In addition, contemporaries frequently quoted cost differentials favourable to the countryside. Already in 1560, Lille, Douai, Valenciennes, Tournai, and nearly a dozen other cities petitioned the central government to forbid rural weaving on the grounds that weak regulations in combination with low taxes and living costs permitted village producers to make cloth for 10–12 patars per ell less than their urban counterparts.[98] Similarly, in 1671 the municipal government of Lille pointed to lower production costs in the countryside to justify vehement but vain opposition to a royal edict opening the city's finishing facilities to certain rural fabrics.[99] Such claims ought not be dismissed simply as urban exaggeration, though doubtless they contained an element of that. Tourcoing's authorities, for instance, speaking in 1748, argued that rural areas could produce cloth for less than Lille because a lower standard of living prevailed. Villagers, they stated, subsisted principally on bread and had clothing and dwellings of 'petite valeur'; in addition, they owed fewer taxes.[100]

For all that, the early modern history of the woollens crafts in our areas also buttresses attempts to refine the explanation of the regional division of labour postulated in the dominant accounts of proto-industrialization. Herman Van der Wee, for one, has pointed out that much rural industry in the southern Netherlands had old and autonomous foundations and an orientation to distant markets independent of urban entrepreneurs. Village crafts did not, that is, simply represent the transfer of activity from town to country.[101] As noted in Part I, many villages and *bourgs* in our regions had produced drapery for export starting in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Furthermore—as

reported in Parts I and II—some of them, as well as others that had never before housed weaving crafts, launched new and light draperies at various times across the medieval and early modern eras, frequently in the teeth of bitter opposition from towns, which wanted to monopolize these same trades.[102] Rural weavers could draw on local wool supplies, combed, carded, and spun by village women and men. In addition, the countryside had merchants and entrepreneurs supplied with capital and direct contacts with finishing and exporting centres like Bruges, Ghent, and Antwerp.[103]

Rather than a countryside passively submitting to urban initiatives, in other words, we need to recognize that both generated economic change, with the result that villages ended up carrying out many of the same functions as cities.[104] Towns tacitly testified to rural dynamism by attempting to appropriate village creations. Lille, for instance, copied *molletons*—invented in Tourcoing—then turned around and tried to forbid their manufacture in the countryside.[105] In short, antagonism as well as complementarity characterized urban–rural industrial relationships. Some of the regional integration postulated by proto-industrialization theory obtained but so did much bitter competition.

Paul Hohenberg has argued that the countryside did not necessarily nor invariably enjoy a clear advantage over urban centres. Cities had various ways of holding down labour costs, and entrepreneurs operating in the countryside could face supervisory and transport problems that raised their expenses.[106] Most urban new or light drapery centres in French Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis have left too little evidence to test Hohenberg's interpretation. In Lille, however, more abundant documentation does suggest that cost-reducing practices helped the city remain a major producer of fabrics for mass export markets across the early modern period. To begin with, the light cloth corporations—which by the later seventeenth century had become essentially employers' associations—started to disregard long-standing prohibitions and permit the hiring of 'unfree' workers in preference to those having earned the corporate franchise.[107] Lille also had a well-developed municipal welfare system which, at least in the sixteenth century, distributed income supplements on a regular basis, thereby allowing wages to stay low.[108]

Equally important, many of Lille's weavers were not wage workers but self-employed petty masters. Such producers could, of course, cut their labour costs by greater exploitation of themselves and the family members who worked with them. Already in the sixteenth century,

moreover, these artisans had shown a remarkable capacity to adopt new fabrics (notably, but not solely, *changéants*) requiring less labour.[109] According to officials in Tournai, a producer of this type ('celui qui travaille sans dépendence' on his own loom or two in his own house) worked harder than those employed in putting-out: thus Tournai was exhorted to find ways of encouraging them.[110] Then, too, accusations that workers in Roubaix kept waste wool and silk, which they sold for their own profit, made less cloth than their employers felt the amount of wool put out called for, and engaged in other sorts of fraud, suggest the existence of costs that could negate the benefits of lower village wages.[111]

There are, in fact, a few hints that on occasion the cost advantage of rural labour narrowed sufficiently that urban weavers could successfully compete. When—in one of the rare surviving cases from Lille's *sayetterie* tribunal—Jean-Baptiste Desruelles was charged in 1698 with putting out thread in violation of corporate rules, it turned out that he employed weavers both in Lille and in the light drapery villages north of town.[112] Dieudonné, reporting a century later, also indicated that urban–rural labour cost differentials may not have been substantial. After giving wages for *molleton* weavers and associated workers in Lille, he added, 'it appears that at Tourcoing, Roubaix and Lannoi [*sic*] the same workers earn a little less [*un peu moins*]'.[113]

Two other strategies may have played an even stronger role in building and sustaining Lille's light woollens. One involved close attention to standards. Lille's light drapery regulations—like those governing earlier types of woollens—consisted largely of technical requirements, mandatory inspections, and rules ordering artisans to take back at their entire loss any piece of cloth found substandard by a merchant (and pay a fine on top).[114] Producers themselves seem to have been convinced that heeding quality paid dividends. In the 1730s, for example, Lille's *sayetteurs* bragged that quality was at the root of their craft's continued existence. Holland merchants, they went on, had found rural cloth so badly made, skimpy, and replete with other problems that they now insisted on buying only fabrics made, inspected, and sealed in Lille.[115] Dieudonné agreed. It was the 'strict observance of regulations', he wrote, that accounted for the 'marked preference' shown for Lille's camlets over those made by competitors.[116] Had Lillois wanted to bolster their position, they could well have cited Valenciennes, where merchants complained bitterly about shoddily made, undersized fabrics passed by inspectors who had become careless once they had bought

their offices.[117] Of course, higher quality did not save Maubeuge's cheap woollens from defeat at the hands of lower-cost competitors.[118] But Maubeuge was selling to peasants and workers, while Lille's light drapery was apparently directed at middling groups in society, for whom quality would presumably be a more important consideration.

The second policy was the acquisition and enforcement of monopolies. To be sure, Lille never managed to impose its ideal, in which the countryside would produce abundant, cheap thread, while the town would weave and finish cloth.[119] As we have seen, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries villages won authorization to make mixed fabrics using *sayette* warps, and thereafter they continually encroached upon what Lille considered its privileges, despite repeated lawsuits and even, on one occasion, the dispatch of a bailiff and guild masters to inspect village goods and perhaps smash illegal looms.[120] The city was, however, successful with respect to fabrics woven entirely of *sayette* thread, keeping exclusive rights within its castelry to says, *changéants*, and later camlets between 1535 and 1777. As a result, Dieudonné credited Lille with housing 800 of the future Département du Nord's 830 camlet looms in 1789.[121]

Certainly contemporaries were convinced of the value of Lille's monopolies. Its own municipal and corporate leaders darkly prophesied mass impoverishment and wholesale emigration—'ruin', in short—every time villagers petitioned for permission to make fabrics claimed by Lille or simply started to weave them.[122] Village producers were also keenly and resentfully cognizant of the advantages bestowed upon towns by monopolies. They argued against such privileges on grounds of both principle—'freedom is the soul of commerce'—and utility. Not only was work needed for village residents, but the examples of England and Holland, 'where there is no distinction between towns and countryside with respect to manufactures', demonstrated that the destruction of privileges would encourage economic growth.[123] Such appeals fell on deaf ears, however, for government officials understood well the significance of monopolies. In 1698, for example, the intendant Bagnols—himself a defender of many urban privileges—admitted that the flowering of Roubaix and Tourcoing's woollen and mixed fabrics would have long since ruined town industries had not 'the making of many stuffs' been reserved to cities.[124]

In the end, of course, neither quality nor monopolies—nor any other strategy—proved able to prevent the erosion of Lille's light drapery and its eventual surpassing by Roubaix's. Taken together, nevertheless,

they helped keep the city's woollen cloth industry going on a large scale over three centuries, and did so not on the basis of a switch to luxury goods but on the basis of fabrics directed at the middle-class market.

From a historiographical perspective, Lille's monopolies point to a significant source of economic development unjustly neglected by proto-industrialization accounts, namely, the role of government intervention. Privileges represented only one facet. Direct subventions were another. Admittedly, grants did not guarantee success, but the implantation of inexpensive carded woollens production in eighteenth-century Lille (cited above) shows their value, particularly when combined with other forms of assistance. These additional types of help frequently included tariff policies. Not only were these critical to Lille's new drapery revival, but in the Austrian Netherlands raising export duties on raw wool exports and abolishing those on combed wool stimulated impressive growth in the wool combing industry.

The latter case—like the history of many other rural and urban textile crafts throughout the three provinces—raises two final considerations about proto-industrialization. First, as presently constituted, proto-industrial interpretations focus on rural–urban production interactions within single regional economies. Relations with other regions are considered from a commercial perspective: proto-industry is differentiated from traditional rural industry by virtue of producing for extra-regional markets. But examination of Walloon Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis indicates a need to consider inter-regional production structures as well. Second, in some instances, inter-regional relations crossed frontiers. At times, production was integrated across these borders. Wool spun and combed in the eighteenth-century Austrian Netherlands, for example, was woven into cloth on the French side. Here the international division of labour resembled the rural–urban division postulated by classical proto-industrialization theories. Yet there was also a good deal of friction across borders, as between town and country. Both the Austrian and the French areas performed spinning and combing as well as weaving, and a range of government policies aimed at developing—even monopolizing—the entire production process at the expense of rivals on the other side of frontiers. Because of their peculiar political and fiscal conditions, then, frontier zones comprised unique types of economic units, both (legally as well as illegally) permeable and divided, that deserve further study and theorization.

The early modern history of the new and light draperies of French Flanders, Hainaut, and the Tournaisis was initially one of rising output and geographical expansion, but ultimately one—with few exceptions—of contraction and concentration. From that perspective, the era from the end of the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century constituted another chapter in the history of the southern Netherlands woollens crafts, another cycle of rise and decline. But if we widen our view to include all textiles, urban and rural—linens, cottons, mixed stuffs, luxury woollens—the period appears as a phase in a longer process of innovation, adoption, and adaptation that once again was renewing the cloth industry in town and country, preparing it for qualitative change as well as quantitative growth.[125]

NOTES

1. This account summarizes all too briefly a very large literature. For overviews, see Coornaert (1950), 59–96; Verhulst (1972), 281–322; Van der Wee (1975); and now John Munro, Ch. 3 in this volume. For essential primary sources and commentary, see Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24); De Sagher (1951–66). Espinas (1923), the only general secondary work, is repetitive and talks little about the historical development of the crafts.
2. See Espinas (1931); Platelle (1982); Jennepin (1889–1909); Verriest (1943), 1–104; Arnould (1969), 130; Arnould (1954), 47–107; Hocquet (1906); Rolland (1957).
3. Coleman (1969), 423.
4. Van der Wee (1975). It is also worth noting that in the early modern Low Countries light drapery was typically made by the members of municipally regulated corporations of *sayetteurs*, *bourgetteurs*, and the like chartered in the years around 1500, whereas new drapery weavers usually belonged to—or at least were governed by—long-established drapery corporations. For a more detailed discussion and further clarification, see Munro, Ch. 3, pts. I and II.
5. Van der Wee (1975); Coleman (1969), 424. Both authors rely on Coornaert (1930*b*). For another instance of terminological discrepancy, cf. kerseys: these light, cheap, and less elaborately fulled cloths—which in Low Countries usage would be considered new draperies—are referred to by Coleman (p. 422) as old drapery.
6. The best guide to the many different kinds of cloth remains Savary des Bruslons (1741). Useful excerpts are published in Lottin (1968), 382–4.
7. De Sagher (1951–66), i. 649–50; ADN, B3762–3. Bousbecque's drapery privilege had been confirmed in 1531, though only a 'bien petite' amount of cloth was being woven there; Dalle (1880), 46, 139. Cf. Linselles, where a flourishing craft that exported to Germany in the second half of the 14th cent. apparently

all but disappeared during the next century. Just one *drapier*, three men recorded as *drapiers et laboureurs*, and a fuller were listed among 52 village notables in 1546, while in 1593 a draper in Bondues reported giving work to three *estamette* (a kind of new drapery) looms in Linselles. De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 655–6. For Bousbecque's and Linselles's earlier drapery, see Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24), i. 339–41; iii. 38–40.

8. AM Lille, Reg. 16,255–357, 895; Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 48–9; AM Lille, Reg. 381, fos. 186^{v}–188^{v}; De Sagher (1937), 479; AM Lille, Aff[aires] gén[érales], C[arton] 1222, d[ossier] 10. See also DuPlessis (1991), 87–8.
9. AM Douai, CC 256–65; HH, Registre des drapiers 1540–1610.
10. ADN, B3762–63; De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 295–6.
11. AM Douai, CC 235–342, HH tiroir 252, Reg. des drapiers 1540–1610; De Sagher (1937), 475, 498; A.P. (1867), 114–33.
12. For the survey, see AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1222, d. 10. Much of it (though little of the quantitative data already cited several times) has been summarized from a document in the municipal archives of Saint-Omer by Deschamps de Pas (1863), 303–29.
13. For the significance of the Baltic and Mediterranean markets, see De Sagher (1951–66), iii. 415–16; Coleman (1969), 424; and Van der Wee (1975), 216. For the domestic market earlier in the 16th cent., see the statement by several Lille merchants in 1545 claiming that Comines's new drapery, sold to 'le commun', had chased cloth from Abbeville, Rouen, 'et autres pays estrangers' out of the Low Countries; De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 52–3.
14. De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 11–12, 296, 303. Some flickers of activity did survive, however: in 1718 and again in 1724 Comines was credited with making a very small quantity of *estamettes*, *perpetuanas*, and mixed cloths; Vanhaeck (1910), i. 294–6; ADN, C112. For Halluin's and Comines's earlier textile history, see Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24), ii. 663–5; i. 618–46.
15. Coleman (1969), 424.
16. De Sagher (1951–66), i. 485–6 (in 1572, many textile artisans were forced to beg or emigrate, while the number of fulling workers, formerly about 70, had fallen to 28, of whom just ten had sufficient work), 192–203, 435–77.
17. De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 304–25, 643–6, 606–8, 616–17, 619; iii. 604; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1222, d. 10.
18. De Sagher (1951–66), iii. 413–21; cf. Calonne (1986), 40–9, 56–7. In 1505, Tourcoing had claimed to be home to 120 drapers as well as 'a crowd of' weavers and fullers, reflecting the importance of its export trade to the Baltic; ADN, B3762. For the village's earlier textile history, see Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24), iii. 398–410.
19. De Sagher (1951–66), i. 203–23, 479–80. The fact that the woollen cloth of Armentières was permitted entry into the Spanish Netherlands even after the French conquest (ibid. 496) may have helped its survival, albeit at a minimal level, into the 18th cent.

20. De Sagher (1951–66), iii. 604; ii. 619. Drapery is known to have survived at Houplines until the mid-18th cent.; ibid. ii. 607.
21. In the early 18th cent., 500 or so cloths a year were still being woven in Haubourdin and the industry limped along until about 1770. See De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 305, 325, 333–6; ADN, C112.
22. Verriest (1943), 63–5, 87–92. In the late 1520s, new drapery also appears to have been woven in Leuze and villages in the triangle between Ath, Leuze, and Ronse (ibid. 62), but I have been unable to discover anything about either its significance then or its later history.
23. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1222, d. 10; Deschamps de Pas (1863), 315–19, 321–2, 326. Tournai suggested that a 'collège des manufactures', consisting of four to five representatives from each province, be established to try to improve textiles, but provided no further details.
24. AEM, Ville de Mons, no. 2088, d. 50.
25. Ch. 3.
26. Initially permitted, say weaving was forbidden in the 14th cent. before being sanctioned once again in 1403. Munro, Ch. 3; Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24), ii. 342–3; iv. 52.
27. AM Douai, HH tiroirs 252 and 269, Reg. CC 256–65; Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 98–101. Cf. Rouche (1985), 74, 95, 121. The relative unimportance of velveteen-making even during *sayetterie*'s period of prosperity is suggested by the fact that from 1542 the seal was farmed out at a rate indicating yearly production that may have been as low as 400 pieces. The sorry state of Douai's light drapery in the early 17th cent. is shown by some *sayetteurs*' long and futile battle between at least 1613 and 1617 to gain permission to migrate to Lille, Arras, and other cities to practise their craft. See AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1166, d. 1.
28. Goris (1925), 297–8, 308–16; Brulez (1959), 483; Deyon and Lottin (1967), 24, 26–7; Everaert (1976), esp. 45–9; Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 204–5; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 429–42. Deyon and Lottin (1967) have shown (pp. 26–7) that at least in the 16th and early 17th cent. variations in Lille's light drapery output corresponded closely to fluctuations in exports from Seville to the New World.
29. See the document cited in Baelde (1984), 1072. The *sayetterie* figure was confirmed about 1575 by guild leaders, who mentioned some 2,050 independent masters and 200 others employed as master workers by their fellows; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1171, d. 9.
30. For a history of and many essential documents on the chief branch of Lille's light drapery, see Vanhaeck (1910); for output, ibid. i. 354; and especially Deyon and Lottin (1967), 26–33. See also DuPlessis (1991), 88–96, which on the basis of tax figures from the municipal accounts (AM Lille, Reg. 16,274 ff.) gives disaggregated data on velveteens and *changéants* produced by *bourgetteurs*. It is impossible to itemize the numbers of *changéants* or other specific fabrics woven by *sayetteurs*, since the tax figures reported in the accounts lump together the various types.

31. Cf. Lille's objection in 1623 to Tourcoing's request to weave certain kinds of light drapery. In Lille, its officials declared, the number of say looms had fallen from 2,985 at some unspecified earlier date to 1,800, and the drop had been even greater among *bourgetteurs*, though no numbers were specified. Lottin (1986*a*), 72.
32. For slightly different loom figures, see Vanhaeck (1910), i. 206, 351–2; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1170, d. 7, 9 and C. 1178, d. 3; Deyon and Lottin (1967), 28 n. 27. Doubtless the number of looms owned by members of the *bourgetterie* guild must also have dropped from the 617 counted in 1612—only 441 of which were currently in operation (AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1164)—but there are no later censuses.
33. The most complete account is Saint-Léger (1906), 367–404, 481–500. See also Baelde (1984); DuPlessis (1991), ch. 3.
34. In addition to the works and documents cited below, see Saint-Léger (1906); Hilaire (1984); Baelde (1984); Leuridan (1868); Trenard (1969), 175–200. All show constant squabbling, attempts by villages to use *sayette* thread and to make better-quality cloth, and towns striving to cut back the number of looms allowed in the countryside, if not to eliminate them entirely. Tourcoing and Roubaix, the largest of the light drapery villages, underwent substantial growth in the early 16th cent., a circumstance cited in their pleas for light drapery privileges. In 1505, Tourcoing counted 607 hearths, in 1549, 1,357; Roubaix went from 317 hearths in 1505 to 472 in 1543 and 600 in 1553. See ADN, B3762–63; Rousseau (1969).
35. Posthumus (1908–39), ii; Moens (1887–8); Schickler (1892).
36. See the graphs taken from Rousseau (1969); Hilaire (1984), 84, 103. In 1631 the leaders of Lille's *sayetterie* corporation alleged that 'a great number of workers', leaving towns to avoid taxes, had begun to weave *bourats*, damasks, grosgrains, and other light textiles, a development that was also causing thread shortages in Lille; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1169, d. 1. Whether or not this movement was occurring, light drapery output in Roubaix at least was at its nadir in precisely those years—and then, frustratingly, the records break off for a quarter of a century.
37. Espinas (1931), 14, 113, 221; Munro, Ch. 3; Platelle (1982), 136.
38. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1222, d. 10 (masters weaving *bouracans*, *draps*, and other woollens may have been included in the figures cited); Deschamps de Pas (1863), 316–19; AM Valenciennes, HH 433, 763: complaints by merchants of Valenciennes and elsewhere about shoddily made fabrics (including says and *changéants*) which had none the less been passed by inspectors. *Sayetteurs* accepted the accusation that their work was inferior, but preferred to blame the merchants both for exporting the best thread and for putting concern for low prices ahead of quality.
39. AGR, Acquits de Lille, no. 1850 portefeuille, contains a document dated Easter Wednesday 1564, in which three Mons merchants pay 1601 livres tournois per year for the *sayetterie* tax for three years. In turn, they are to collect two sols

tournois for each say made in Mons, as well as 12 deniers tournois on each *demi-say*, *colpon*, *cornette*, *pas de satin*, *reversé*, *changéant*, *buze d'orge*, and velveteen, all of which are said to have been made in Mons for 'peu de temps'. I discovered this document by chance, so perhaps consultation of the dozens of other portfolios containing material on Mons would yield additional information. Unfortunately, most of the several hundred sheets in each of the several portfolios I examined are rotting and many are illegible.

40. AEM, Ville de Mons, no. 2088.
41. Jennepin (1889–1909), ii. 434–5, 439.
42. Munro, Ch. 3; Hocquet (1906), 259–60; Soil (1891). I am grateful to Patrick Chorley for the latter reference.
43. These figures are calculated from Tournai's municipal accounts, AGR, Chambre des Comptes, Reg. 39,939–40,064. For a more complete analysis, see DuPlessis (1990), 66–75. For the 1580s measures, see Hocquet (1906), 289, 291.
44. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1220, d. 10; C. 1164.
45. See AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1177, d. 4 (1693–1702); Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 252–4 (1721); ADN, C182 (1785); and the general discussion in Vanhaeck (1910), i. 311–13.
46. The purchases were completed in 1766. Alain Lottin (1985), 121; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 436 n. 1; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1197, d. 6; Vanhaeck (1910), i. 318.
47. ADN, C1660, pièce 161; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 436 n. 1. According to the prefect, Douai did a little twisting of linen thread, but most work associated with linen was found outside the city, in the direction of Valenciennes. The 4,000–5,000 pieces of linen sealed annually in Douai between 1769 and 1773 (ADN, C3891) appear to have come from village producers. Certainly the municipal government reported in 1782 (ADN, C1660, pièce 161) that no one in Douai was making linens for the market, though a couple of people wove for local residents, who furnished the thread.
48. For the immigration of a *baracan* maker and 'plusieurs' workers from Valenciennes about 1665, see AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1171, d. 7. See also a report by the Director General of the *Bureaux du Roy* in Flanders (ibid., C. 1172, d. 4, 12 Nov. 1671), which mentions the recent adoption of Brussels and Holland-style camlets, as well as *draps* and serges in the English and Dutch fashions. For encouragement, by means of grants, loans, and other inducements, of immigration of masters from Hondschoote, who in 1676 numbered 12, controlling 86 looms, see ibid., C. 1175, d. 1.
49. For looms and masters, see Vanhaeck (1910), i. 352–3; the loom figures are also printed in Deyon and Lottin (1967), 28 n. 27, the yearly output on pp. 32–3.
50. Ibid. 28 n. 27.
51. Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 203, doc. 100, 28 Aug. 1694. Production years ran from 1 Nov. to 31 Oct. In 1696, the *bourgetteurs* reported to the intendant that more than 1,000 masters were unemployed or working for other masters and that more than 1,200 looms were idle; Braure (1932), ii. 370 n. 1. The number of looms in operation is, of course, at best a very approximate guide to output, as

is seen when it is possible to compare the number of cloths sealed and looms in operation. Calculations using figures on pieces sealed certified by town officials (Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 203, doc. 100) show that in 1686 60,116 *sayetterie* fabrics were woven on 1052 looms (an average of 57.14 cloths per loom), in 1688 61,817 cloths on 904 looms (68.38 per loom), and in 1692 49,627 pieces on 785 looms (63.22 per loom).

52. Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 236 (Vanhaeck's text [ibid. i. 352] incorrectly has 571 looms in operation in 1716, and this mistake is reproduced by Deyon and Lottin (1967), 28 n. 27); Braure (1932), ii. 371–2.
53. John (1967), 180. The years 1698–1709, cited as the earlier time of significant growth for Yorkshire (ibid.) also saw an upturn in Lille.
54. Vanhaeck (1910), i. 284 n. 2; Deyon and Lottin (1969), 28 n. 27. No information has survived regarding numbers of looms in operation between 1716 and 1764. Yorkshire woollens went through a renewed period of growth in 1769–72; John (1967), 180. Though a document dating from 1751 estimates that 300 *sayetterie* and 250 *bourgetterie* masters were currently working in Lille—no figures for looms are given but the totals seem likely (Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 329–31)—a 1778 report (ADN, C111) that mentions 470 masters in the two crafts, giving work to 2,060 looms, appears to be exaggerated. It may, however, include looms controlled by Lillois but located in the countryside or reflect the 'considerable' sales of Lille camlets in America during the Revolution mentioned by Dieudonné (1804), ii. 439, who unfortunately provides no figures. He does note, however, that 'since the peace' the Americans 'have gone back to [buying] English fabrics'.
55. Deyon and Lottin (1967), 28 n. 27; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 436–9. In light of the numbers reported in 1782—to which should be added an unknown quantity of *bourgetterie* looms—Dieudonné's figure appears plausible. Based on information given ibid. 444, it can be calculated that some 29,200 camlets (the generic name for *changéants* and similar fabrics) were woven in Lille in 1789.
56. For Lille, see AM Lille, Reg. 9745–88. Some 66 active masters and 205 workers were listed in 1711, 21 masters and 61 workers in 1761, 36 masters and at least 178 workers in 1781, 34 masters and at least 104 workers in 1789. In the last two years cited, workers were undercounted because masters currently holding corporate office did not report employees. For Tourcoing, see ADN, C111 (400 French workers said to be employed in combing establishments in the Austrian Netherlands, but they did not constitute the totality of the workforce there), and Dieudonné (1804), ii. 411–23 (his Tourcoing total of 1600 includes, but does not distinguish, those working in surrounding villages). For the 4,000 knitters in Lille, its suburbs, Armentières, and its neighbourhood who in 1789 used *sayette* thread, see ibid. 448–9.
57. Braure (1932) ii. 396–8; Saint-Léger (1906), 387; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 423–36. If a report of 1778 (ADN, C111) is correct that 2,500 pieces of *pinchinat* were produced in Lille each year at that time, the 1780s had witnessed major growth in the industry, but apparently no long-term statistics exist.

According to Dieudonné (1804), ii. 412–13, wool for carding came mainly from the waste generated by combers, from lambs, and from the stomachs, necks, and paws of sheep—all of which had a nap too short for combing.

58. See the graphs taken from Rousseau (1969); Hilaire (1984), 84, 103.
59. For markets, see Leuridan (1863), v. 77, and Dieudonné (1804), ii. 442; for wages, see Kerridge (1985), 241–2.
60. Leuridan (1863), v. 88.
61. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 439–42.
62. Leuridan (1863), v. 67, 88. According to Dieudonné (1804), ii. 442, one-twentieth of *calamandes* were sold in the Département du Nord, another four-twentieths in the interior of France, so the competition from English imports would have been keenly felt.
63. Comparison of Table 14 with Roubaix's output figures shows that the number of looms tripled across the 18th cent., while output grew sevenfold, suggesting that many weavers must have changed from part-time to full-time textile work across this period.
64. AM Tourcoing, 2HH1; ADN, C119; for seizures, AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1191, d. 4, C. 1196, d. 4. Some of the work may have been carried out in Mouscron, which abutted Tourcoing on the Austrian Netherlands side of the border. According to the village tax collector, in 1762 two-thirds of about 200 *molleton* workers (including 60 weavers and 80 spinners) in Mouscron worked for *fabriquans* of Tourcoing, using mainly *sayette* thread from across the frontier. See Brausch (1983), 32, 35. I owe this reference to Professor Hugo Soly.
65. AM Tourcoing, 2HH2, 31 Oct. 1789.
66. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 428–9, 436–42. With the 142 cited in Table 14, the village housed at least 502 looms making cheap woollens and mixed stuffs. A document from late 1790 (AM Tourcoing, 2HH2), a time when all Tourcoing's trades were said to be 'languishing', mentions 700 looms giving work to 3,800 individuals, including 800 combers, and turning out 15,400 pieces of cloth, notably 10,000 *molletons*, 1,450 serges, *prunelles*, *bourats*, and the like, 1,200 other *calamandes*, and 2,450 pieces of cotton and linen fabric.
67. ADN, C112; AM Tourcoing, 2HH1, fos. 8–10, 2HH2. See also n. 64 above.
68. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 414–19.
69. ADN, C111, 112; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 427–9, 442–3. Lannoy residents also spun wool for *molletons*. For the bourg's long struggles with Lille over the latter's monopoly claims, see Vanhaeck (1910), i. 298–307.
70. ADN, C199.
71. Dieudonné (1804) subsumes most of the textile activities of these smaller centres under those of Tourcoing and Roubaix; only spinning gets separate mention.
72. AGR, Chambre des Comptes, Reg. 40,065–124.
73. ADN, C3869.
74. ADN, C 1490; Moureaux (1974–81), i. 32, 514–19, 525–6; Craeybeckx (1976), 43 n. 71. Stocking-making also busied 300–400 looms and employed 550 city

people in the 1760s; by this point, the goods were made of wool, flax, and cotton. See DuPlessis (1990), 71. Professors Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly of the Free University of Brussels inform me that the AGR, Conseil des finances, contains additional documents on Tournai cloth manufactures in the later 18th cent., but I have been unable to consult them.

75. AEM, Ville de Mons, no. 2088, doss. 50.
76. Heirwegh (1980–1), 737; Heirwegh (1983), 312–13. I should like to thank Dr Heirwegh for sending me copies of his publications on Mons.
77. Moureaux (1974–81), i. 554–5, 559, 561, 566; Heirwegh (1980–1), 736–43; Heirwegh (1983), 309–13.
78. AM Valenciennes, HH 509. See also HH Sup. 303, for a complaint by *sayetteurs* in 1658 that linen weavers were taking away work by making cloth (perhaps *molletons*) with *sayette* thread.
79. Guignet (1977), i. 53–6 and *passim*; ADN, C9249 (source of the quotation about serge and *cazée* production); ADN C8815, 1729 (source of the information on wool supplies). The poor state of the woollens trades can be further gauged by Hainaut's negative response to a suggestion in 1762 that advantage be taken of a rupture in commercial relations between England and Spain to produce cheap fabrics like *bayettes*, *sempiternes*, and *châlons*. Provincial leaders demurred on the grounds that linen spinning occupied everyone in the region. Lille, Roubaix, and Tourcoing, they suggested, could much better undertake such a project; Guignet (1977), 81–2. Writing in 1804, Dieudonné (1804), ii. 443, commented that Valenciennes had once been famous for *baracans*, which industry employed more than 500 people before high taxes and other problems drove away its workers.
80. Jennepin (1889–1909), ii. 445, 447; ADN C9086, C9249. Cf. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 431, who noted that 'in the past' consumers preferred Maubeuge *cazées* to those made in 'rural communes', because of the hand-stretching that gave it 'more firmness', but added that he did not know 'whether that reason for preference' still existed.
81. Caffiaux (1873), 325.
82. Markovitch (1976), 186, for the 1788 estimate; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 430–3, for the 1789 figure.
83. Guignet (1977), i. 202–4. Markovitch (1976), 186, estimates the value of the area's linens to have been fourteen times that of woollens.
84. Moureaux (1974–81), i. 530, 574–5. Ath, once a new drapery town but now a prominent linen centre, had one *panne* weaver making ten cloths a year; ibid. 638.
85. Ibid. 674–5, 642–3. A brief report in 1751 (ibid. 37) asserted that the manufacture of mixed linen and woollen cloth (perhaps the *molletons* specified in 1764) daily employed 800 workers at Chimay, 600 of them to prepare the thread. These numbers, far in excess of those given thirteen years later, may be exaggerations or may refer to all those engaged in textiles throughout the area.

86. Cf. around Mons, Sars-la-Bruyère and Blaregnies (Moureaux (1974–81), i. 610); Grandrieu, Montignies-Saint-Christophe, and Sivry near Beaumont (ibid. 669–70, 674, 681); and Forges, Seloignes, Momignies, and Macon in the vicinity of Chimay (ibid. 647, 649, 662, 665–7).
87. Ibid. 617 n. 2, 669–70, 672–3.
88. ADN, C8815.
89. Moureaux (1974–81), i. 545, 514. Many other spinners and combers are listed in ibid., *passim*.
90. From the 16th cent., Lille had relied on a far-flung network of spinners throughout its own province, Artois, and even Picardy, and by the 18th cent. Roubaix was also getting thread from these areas. See AM Lille, Reg. 145, fols. 178–78^{v}; Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 101, 155; ADN, C111; Dieudonné, (1804), ii. 419–20; Leuridan (1863), v. 86.
91. A census from *c.*1759 counted 3,725 linen looms turning out 55,875 pieces a year in 33 *bourgs* and villages in the Lys valley between la Gorgue up-river from Armentières and Comines down-river, as well as surrounding villages five km. to the east (towards Lille) and 20 km. to the west. A total of 1695 looms were to be found in the 18 *bourgs* and villages in French Flanders. According to an attached document, the making of table linen, a speciality of Armentières, had been established there in 1735 by order of the four bailiffs who administered rural French Flanders. Twenty-one bleaching houses were also to be found along the Lys, eight of them in Armentières. See ADN, C166.
92. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 263–5.
93. Ibid. 439. The prefect gave no figures, but the number of seals reported in Vanhaeck (1910), i. 284 n. 2, shows that yearly output, 26,000 in 1772–4, fell to 22,000 in 1775 and 17,200 in 1776. Then it rose to 22,900 (1777), 22,000 (1778), 26,000 (1779), and 25,000 (1780), before falling off sharply to 15,000 in 1781 and 20,000 in 1782 and 1783, the last years reported.
94. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 263–5, 308–18, 238. Cf. ADN, C1660.
95. For classic statements, see Mendels (1972), 241–61; (1982), 67–107; Kriedte (1981); Deyon (1984), 868–80. Though Charles Tilly 'in principle' erases the distinction between urban and rural industries, in practice he adopts the usual contrast; see Tilly (1983), 123–42.
96. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1164.
97. ADN, C111; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1201, d. 15; Braure (1932), ii. 403–4; Dieudonné (1804), ii. 308–18, 443, 458–59; Moureaux (1974–81), i. 32, 513–14, 554–6.
98. The document is printed in *Cartulaire d'Arras* (Arras, 1863), 402–5. Cf. the like arguments set forth by Lille in 1553 in opposition to Roubaix's bid to make *bourgetterie* fabrics, as printed in Baelde (1984), 1073.
99. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1172, d. 3. The size of the gap is indicated by the requirement that for each piece of rural wool damask dyed and finished in Lille 5 patars had to be paid to the city's cloth gilds. Cf. the city's *sayetteurs*' complaint in 1688 that lower wages allowed village fabrics to undersell Lille's by two or

three florins apiece, as cited in Lottin (1968), 95. Cf. also ADN, C181 (1785), in which Lille's officials predicted that were they permitted to do so, most employers would leave towns to take advantage of lower rural rents, taxes, and cost of living.

100. ADN, C119. Cf. an 18th-cent. remonstrance (ADN C128) by corporate leaders against numerous taxes in Lille which allegedly drove up prices and risked encouraging dyers, at least, to leave the city for the tax-exempt castelry.
101. Van der Wee (1984), 59–77. The same argument can be found in Van der Wee (1988), 307–81.
102. The best account of this drawn-out conflict remains Saint-Léger (1906).
103. For wool, see esp. Verhulst (1972), and reports about herds in ADN, B3762–63. For early commercial contacts, see Espinas and Pirenne (1906–24), *passim*. For merchants from village centres at Antwerp in the 16th cent., see Coornaert (1961), ii. 358 ff., 'Liste provisoire de noms de marchands français ayant travaillé à ou avec Anvers de 1460 à 1585'. For a draper of Bondues who controlled three *estamette* looms in Linselles in 1593 and a draper from Linselles who had two looms working for him in Bondues at the same date, see De Sagher (1951–66), ii. 655–6, 645–6. For 18th-cent. petty capitalists in Tourcoing, Roubaix, Mouvaux, Croix, and many other *bourgs* and villages, see AM Tourcoing, 2HH11. Cf. also AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1164, for traces of village entrepreneurs owning looms in the early 17th cent.
104. Finishing constituted the main—and always contested—exception. Lille, at least, always tried to use exclusion from its finishing facilities as a means of damaging rural cloth. Thanks to their commercial contacts, however, many village producers were able to minimize the effects of the prohibition by sending their goods to Ghent and Amsterdam, where they claimed also to get better-quality work performed and at lower cost than Lille could provide. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1172, d. 3.
105. See ADN, C119, C199; AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1190, d. 3, C. 1191, d. 3, 4, C. 1196, d. 4.
106. Hohenberg (n. d.). See also Hohenberg and Lees (1985), pt. II.
107. See AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1183, d. 7, C. 1184, d. 5, C. 1212, d. 3; Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 305–6; Braure (1932), ii. 399–400. The evolution of the guilds is aptly symbolized by the *bourgetteurs*' decision in 1699 to exclude everyone save masters from the annual banquet, formerly an inclusive occasion; AM Lille, Reg. 14,731, fo. 9.
108. DuPlessis (1977), 185–219.
109. See DuPlessis and Howell (1982), pt. III; DuPlessis (1991), ch. 3.
110. Moureaux (1974–81), i. 515.
111. Trenard (1984*a*), 101–2.
112. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1179, d. 4.
113. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 428–9. *Molletons* were the only cloth made in substantial quantities both in Lille and in the villages. Dieudonné also cited wages for

weavers and others making camlets and *calamandes* (ibid. 437, 440), but the former were made almost exclusively in Lille, the latter entirely in rural centres.

114. Cf. the documents printed in Vanhaeck (1910), ii, for these regulations.
115. Ibid. i. 108–9. Cf. the claim made around 1575 by *sayetterie* guild officials that besides all its other virtues, the system of small shops enforced in Lille facilitated supervision and thus helped guarantee merchants cloth of consistent quality. AM Lille, Aff. gén., C. 1171, d. 9, discussed in DuPlessis (1991), 111–14, and DuPlessis and Howell (1982), 72.
116. Dieudonné (1804), ii. 439.
117. AM Valenciennes, HH Sup. 763. The claim that the inspectors did a poor job may have had some merit, for in 1602 the city government condemned them for having passed 'very damaged' cloth and fined each one; ibid., HH 433. Cf. Guignet (1977), 53.
118. ADN, C9086.
119. For a clear and forceful articulation of this vision, see the document cited in Baelde (1984).
120. The officials were driven off violently in Croix, a dependency of Roubaix. For the incident, see Trenard (1984*b*), 52–4. Similarly, Lille's attempt to take over *molleton* production, though officially countenanced by successive intendants, never came close to destroying Tourcoing's craft. ADN, C119; Daussy (1986), 103.
121. See Saint-Léger (1906); Vanhaeck (1910), i, chs. 17–19; and Deyon and Lottin (1967), 32–3. In keeping with Lille's monopolies, in 1728 the intendant ordered Roubaix to stop making *callemandiles*, developed in the *bourg* for the Spanish and Indies markets. Several years later, Roubaix was stymied in an attempt to take up camlets and *polimites*; Leuridan (1863), 70–2, 77. Tourcoing, as noted above, was likewise supposed to give up to Lille the *molleton* industry that it had developed.
122. For two printed examples, see Lille's reply to Roubaix in 1553, cited in Baelde (1984), 1073, and its opposition to Tourcoing's bid in 1623 to weave wide *bourats* and damasks, quoted in Lottin (1986*a*), 72–3.
123. Both quotations are from a protest by Tourcoing, 15 Mar. 1700, ADN, C169. Many other rural protests are cited in Baelde (1984); Saint-Léger (1906); and Braure (1932).
124. Cited in Braure (1932), ii. 379. For Bagnols's support of Lille's exclusion of rural light drapery from its finishing facilities, see Vanhaeck (1910), ii. 201, doc. 98. For acknowledgement of the importance of privileges to Lille by a later intendant, see ibid. ii. 274–8, doc. 131.
125. The research for this paper was supported by grants from Swarthmore College and the Travel to Collections program of the National Endowment for the Humanities (Grant FE-22955-89).